

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2005**

REGULAR MEETING

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in regular meeting in the Plaza Level Conference Room, Melvin Municipal Building, on Tuesday, October 18, 2005 at 5:10 p.m. Commissioners present were: Chair Joe Wood, Bill Benjamin, Jerry Leimenstoll and Scott Lilly. Dan Curry, Barbara Harris and Dyan Arkin represented the Housing and Community Development Department (HCD), Dan Reynolds, Manager of Code Inspections for the City, and Danny Nall, Superintendent, Local Code Enforcement, and Jim Blackwood, Esq., was present as legal counsel for the Commission.

Chair Wood called the meeting to order introduced himself and had the other Commissioners identify themselves. He welcomed everyone to the meeting. He asked that anyone wishing to speak come up to the microphone, identify themselves, and give their address for the record.

Chair Wood said the agenda would be taken out of order to accommodate some of the speakers present.

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2005.

Mr. Leimenstoll moved acceptance of the minutes of the September 20, 2005 meeting as written, seconded by Mr. Lilly. The Commission voted 3-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wood, Benjamin, Leimenstoll, Lilly. Nays: None. Abstain: Benjamin.)

2. OLE ASHEBORO NEIGHBORHOOD. UPDATE FROM STAFF ON 326 AND 328 LEE STREET. (CONTINUED)

Ms. Harris asked if Mr. Defreitas was going to be represented by counsel? Chair Wood said he did not see counsel for Mr. Defreitas present.

Clarence Defreitas, 3406 Canterbury, said all he was asking the Commission for was to give him a notice before meetings. At 3 o'clock today he got a notice that they had to be here. His wife is on the way, but has not arrived. He didn't know if his attorney was coming or not.

Bill Benjamin said that Lisa Johnson-Tonkins, Esq., was with his law firm so he would to abstain. He would go outside and see if he could reach Ms. Johnson-Tonkins.

Mr. Curry said he did try to reach Clint Gravely's office earlier today. He was out of town. His receptionist said to their knowledge they had provided some plans to the attorney, but staff had not seen those plans yet. So staff was hoping she would be here also.

Counsel Blackwood suggested that they wait until Mr. Benjamin returned with information as to whether he could reach Ms. Johnson-Tonkins or not.

4. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS.

Dyan Arkin said she was Community Planner with HCD. She presented a map of Habitat's proposed development on the Bingham Street site and said this is an updated version that they just received from the engineers this afternoon. Jerry Leimenstoll, at the Commission's direction, had met several times with representatives from Habitat, including their designer and their engineer and just basically fine-tuned the site plan. The majority of the issues that came up had to do with the site plan as opposed to the building plans so they really focused on the site plan with Habitat's cooperation and some input from us and input from them, she said they had come up with a plan everybody was happy with. It includes some pretty significant areas of outdoor living space. She explained how each unit would have exterior green space. Indicating on the map, she said they also made changes to make a more solid building face along one street to allow for a little more space to make these outdoor green spaces and allow an opportunity for there to be some nice backyards for the units. Staff was bringing this back to the Commission as an update and to let the Commission know they had done what the Commission asked. The Commission's representative, Mr. Leimenstoll, was tremendously helpful in the process.

2. OLE ASHEBORO NEIGHBORHOOD. UPDATE FROM STAFF ON 326 AND 328 EAST LEE STREET (CONTINUED)

Mr. Benjamin returned and said he had left a message for Ms. Johnson-Tonkins. Either she was on the phone or had left.

Chair Wood asked if there were any suggestion as to what they should do at this point? The plans are at the attorney's office.

Mr. Curry suggested that they might want to consider delaying this until the next meeting. Staff will follow up with a Notice to the attorney.

Mr. Leimenstoll moved the Commission have staff contact Mr. Defrietas and his attorney to give us an update at the Commission's next meeting.

Mr. Curry asked Mr. Defrietas if he talked with Mr. Gravely about actually entering into a contract to do the plans for the house?

Mr. Defrietas said with what Mr. Gravely charged him, he had no choice. He would do it. He wanted that home; he would live in that home and whatever it takes for him to live in it, he will be there.

Mr. Curry asked Mr. Defrietas if he had actually received anything back from Mr. Gravely in terms of plans for the house?

Mr. Defrietas what was given to him was like the final plans so he could go in and do everything in that house. He said he would like to point out that when the appraiser went in two years ago, the City gave him a plan of that house.

Mr. Leimenstoll said they were not talking about just a plan; they were talking revisions that Mr. Defrietas planned to make. As he understood it, there was a work schedule and some financial information that they had discussed in Mr. Defrietas' presence at previous meeting that has to be part of this package.

Chair Wood said they would try again on November 15 and hopefully Mr. Defrietas' attorney would be here with the revised plans from the architect.

Mr. Defrietas asked that he be given more than four hours' notice.

Chair Wood said he was giving Mr. Defrietas notice now that the matter would be before the Commission on November 15, 2005 at 5 o'clock in this room.

Chair Wood was reminded that there had been a motion for continuance in the case of Mr. Defrietas and no second had been made and no vote taken.

Mr. Benjamin said he saw Ms. Johnson-Tonkins walk in the door so it might turn out that that motion is not necessary.

Chair Wood said the motion by Mr. Leimenstoll died for lack of a second.

Mr. Defreitass stepped out of the room to consult with his attorney.

4. OLD ASHEBORO NEIGHBORHOOD. TRANSFER OF PROPERTY TO GREENSBORO HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP, INC.

Chair Wood said the Commission really had only one more item of business on the agenda and that is a transfer of property to the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership, but as part of something that the Commission is working on; they wanted to have some representatives from Code Enforcement here. Ole Asheboro is one of the oldest redevelopment projects and has been in existence for 20-plus years. Millions of dollars have been spent in Ole Asheboro on making this a more viable neighborhood and great strides have been made.

As part of the business today, the Commission intends to transfer land to the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership that they hope to market to private developers to spur more growth in the area and do more rehabilitation of the neighborhood.

Two meetings ago, Nettie Coad, who is a member of this Commission, talked to them about some continuing blight in the neighborhood. In fact, she invited the Commissioners to come to the neighborhood to look at examples of dilapidated housing and other eyesores in the neighborhood. Jerry Leimenstoll, Scott Lilly and he went with Ms. Coad. Barbara Harris and Dan Curry also came along, and they walked a large portion of Ole Asheboro and saw a couple of pockets of real neglect. They were trying to find a way to attack that problem. Some of the answer might be for us to go get more money in the Redevelopment Commission's budget and go after these properties, declare them blighted and buy them as a last resort. But some of the problems have to do with absentee landlords that just do not keep up their properties.

They wanted to present some of the things they found in the neighborhood. They would like Code Enforcement to at least go out and see what they can do to help us. They are not saying they have to go in and just run roughshod or anything, but make some suggestions to us; help us so that we can do our job and help us protect the investment of the millions of dollars that we put into this neighborhood.

Dan Reynolds, Code Enforcement Manager for the Inspections Division of the City of Greensboro, said they did look at the list of properties of concern to the Commissioners in the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood. One of the things that they still have to do is give the properties their due process right, which property owners know better than we do. As part of that process, sometimes it does seem like these situations linger.

Mr. Reynolds said there was another tool that can be used. The General Statutes will allow them to invoke a Statute that gives the property owner less time to bring the property into compliance or it goes to demolition and the length of that time is basically 60 days. If the property is not in compliance in 60 days, Code Enforcement can take it to the Housing Commission and order it demolished.

Chair Wood said the Commission wanted to know what tools were available to the Commission and how can they work with other departments within the City, whether it be Code or law enforcement or whatever.

Mr. Reynolds went over the procedures that had to be used to have a property demolished or renovated, especially with absentee landlords.

Mr. Leimenstoll asked Mr. Reynolds to walk them through the due process requirements. Mr. Reynolds complied.

Chair Wood said the sad part of this picture was that most of the houses appear to be structurally sound and decent housing stock if they just would spend some money to fix them up.

Mr. Reynolds said that was the down side of using the General Statute because it specifically speaks to the structural integrity of the property, where using our normal process, we can use more non-structural or more facial issues to require them to do things that are not just

structural, but more aesthetic compliance.

Mr. Benjamin asked how action by the Code Enforcement is initiated on these properties.

Mr. Reynolds said it could be several different ways and enumerated and explained those. One of the good features about the Rental Unit Certificate of Occupancy program is that you can't rent a property that is not in compliance. Most of their complaints come from folks who have already moved into a property where the owner has promised to fix things and it never happens. Most of the properties on the Commissioners' list are in their system and working through the process.

Mr. Lilly said, as Chair Wood mentioned, the Commission had spent \$30 million for redevelopment neighborhoods. Four hundred fifty properties had been rebuilt or demolished. Thirty historic homes have been restored. Four neighborhoods have streetscapes. Those were kind of the investments they had made so far. What they want to do is protect their investment. As Chair Wood said, the taxpayers are vested in \$30 million. The property owners in the neighborhood are especially interested in having us get the issue resolved and he was sure the City Council was getting tired of hearing about this. He had been on the Commission for seven years and now Old Asheboro was 22-years old. He thought what they had here was a cyclical problem. We identify blighted property. We as the Redevelopment Commission acquire the property. The City rehabs and sells the property and builds new properties. Then again the property is allowed go to blighted. He thought the problem is that they had slumlords and unfit owners in Greensboro and either they cannot or will not maintain their property to Greensboro's standards or Code. They think if the owners were to be held accountable, either they should be held accountable or be forced to sell.

Chair Wood said that was one thing they weren't sure about. They knew that that was really not a Code problem, but they knew that the City could go in and make people cut their grass or clean it up or they will go in and do it and send them the bill. There were two or three vacant lots that were overgrown; rats and vagrants hang out on them.

Mr. Reynolds said a lot of that was the result of their demolition process. They tear down a property because the property owner didn't maintain it; then they don't maintain the lot. He said many times they had to do the same things to get a lot cut as they did to get a house repaired or demolished. In order for the City to cut the grass or remove debris from the property, they have to go through the same process of giving the owner notice, etc.

Chair Wood said one of the things the Redevelopment Commission does sometimes is assemble parcels of land to use. He asked if there might be a way in the future, should you demolish one of these houses, that you could inform Mr. Curry, particularly if it is in the center of a Redevelopment Neighborhood.

Counsel Blackwood said if he were correct, if you have a house that is structurally unsound and you go in and demolish it, you're allowed to put a lien on the property for the cost of the demolition. But at the time, the owner still owns it and he is supposed to pay the City back for the demolition cost. So then, if he doesn't pay the City back for it, you, in effect, have to

institute an action to enforce your lien and then proceed to sell the property, either through the City itself to take title through cost of the demolition or to some other third party who would take care of the property. But the demolition and the cost of it itself, at that point in time, you still have an owner that owns the underlying land to the property. That is what creates also this issue right here, that once you demolish, it is still theirs, even though the lien is there, and the lien itself doesn't trigger the right to sell. Then you have got to go through a whole other proceeding to enforce the lien and proceed with the sale.

Mr. Reynolds said that was correct.

Chair Wood said the Commission did not want to be confrontational with Code Inspections; they want to be their partners.

Mr. Reynolds said one of the problems he saw, as Manager of the Division, they are still trying to use old rules to handle some new problems. The rules had to be changed.

Chair Wood asked Manager Reynolds how they could affect the change on some of the things they needed to do or how did he see that we affect this change?

Mr. Reynolds said in his opinion he thought Council would be amenable to some type of suggestions for things that they could do. He had been to a couple of seminars in other parts of the State and outside the State where a lot of jurisdictions are dealing with the same issues where property owners just will not take care of their property. One of the things they are doing in Virginia through the legislature is when a property owner's structure is demolished, then you only have to send that property owner one notice each 12 months to cut that grass. After that first notice, if it is not cut, the City cuts it and sends the owner a bill.

Chair Wood said they had been talking about how to go about this. They would rather work with the staff and with the City. Maybe if they could go as a united front to Council and say, look, we have a lot of different segments of the City and Boards and Commissions working on this. Help us find a solution.

Mr. Reynolds said they went on a bus tour with Council recently and they looked at a lot of these properties. One of his suggestions would be modifying some of the rules, not necessarily to run roughshod, but to make the process more effective.

Mr. Benjamin said previously he had talked with Mr. Nall and felt there some miscommunication there. There had been instances where Inspections was going to tear down a property that was on the Commission's acquisition list. He thought the Commission and Inspections should work more closely to see that this did not happen in the future.

Mr. Lilly said he thought part of the reason that they have a continual problem is because these slumlords and unfit owners are allowed to occupy condemned structures. They receive a benefit from the property.

Mr. Reynolds said it was not legal to rent condemned property, but there are examples of it

all over the neighborhood.

Mary Elizabeth Black, 409 Burtner Street, said a house nearby had been burned. She had met the man who owned the house. He said he and his wife were in court last year for divorce and he wasn't going to fix up the house until he found out who was going to get the house. So this is the third year this house has been like that. She wanted to know what they could do about it.

Mr. Reynolds said he didn't know what the status of it was, but he would be glad to find out.

A long discussion ensued where Commissioners asked questions and received answers as to several aspects of blighted or condemned properties or those nearing condemnation. They also discussed properties that either did not have water service or electric service and what could be done under those circumstances.

Mr. Lilly suggested there should be a documented process whereby Code Enforcement or any other source could report to the Commission any condemned or blighted houses in any of the Redevelopment areas. He said if Mr. Reynolds would submit to the Commission his suggestions, they could use Code Enforcement as a tool in their Redevelopment efforts.

Counsel Blackwood said, first of all, the Commission already used them to almost invariably define what is a Redevelopment area and an area that is already blighted and that is how it is going to be defined or its going to be defined as a reconditioning area, which is an area that is tending to be going that way if you don't step in and take steps as to the individual properties that themselves already meet the definition of blight. The Planning Board is the body that certifies those areas and then we develop a plan. Ours is a long-term plan and we use the City's reports to help assist us in identifying to the Planning Board those areas that should so be defined. Once it comes to us and we develop a plan and develop an acquisition list, identifying those properties, that's part of where you then get into the process and the problem because when we identify and locate those and approve that plan and the City Council approves our plan, if we didn't list the property across the street, which at the time was in okay shape, but during the course of the process of redevelopment, then becomes deteriorated, we have to go back through the amendment process to add it to the acquisition list unless they voluntarily sell. We are concerned with big areas of blight and trying to remove them. Code Enforcement is usually concerned with individual parcels. But since they are individual parcels, the Commission has no power at that time to acquire that property once the plan has been adopted unless we amend it or there is a voluntary sale.

The discussion continued as to the correct approach to look at this problem over the long-term. Plan amendment was discussed as a means of acquiring some of the properties that continued to be dilapidated or near blight.

Counsel Blackwood said they could update a plan to take into account parcels, structures that have subsequently met the definition required because something else has happened or an individual parcel has deteriorated. But it requires then amending the plan, adding it to the acquisition list, going through the Planning Board, City Council and then a public hearing to

finish the process.

Mr. Benjamin and Mr. Lilly both made suggestions of things that could be done to get undesirable properties under the auspices of the Redevelopment Commission so the problems could be corrected.

Chair Wood thanked Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Nall for coming and giving the Commission information as to how Code Enforcement works. He said he hoped that the Commission could work proactively with them in the future.

Mr. Curry thanked the members of the Commission who had been out to see the properties in Ole Asheboro. He also thanked Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Nall for attending the meeting and giving the Commission a better understanding of their role. He said staff was going to try and have a member attend the Minimum Housing Standards Commission monthly meeting. He asked Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Nall to send them any periodic updates on condemned properties in Redevelopment areas and staff would explore what needs to happen from the Redevelopment Commission standpoint.

2. OLE ASHEBORO NEIGHBORHOOD. UPDATE FROM STAFF ON 326 AND 328 EAST LEE STREET (CONTINUED)

Lisa Johnson-Tonkins, Esq., 101 West Friendly Avenue, said she had with her the survey report. They had a site meeting at the Defreitas property. The Defreitases have presented a floor plan to Clinton Gravely & Associates. She had spoken with Mr. Gravely on a couple of occasions, but she also spoke with him today. He indicated that he spoke with the guy who was doing the site plan and that was supposed to be to him tomorrow. He will be able to do cost figures at that time to present to the Commission. He said the floor plans were in good shape. He just could not make any comment or recommendation on the site plans until he had actually seen them. That is where they are at this point. Mr. Defreitas had supplied her with a copy of the floor plans and the survey report. As soon as Mr. Gravely gives an estimation of cost to Mr. Defreitas, then he can proceed to get his financial plans in order for the Commission.

Mr. Curry said staff needed to receive a copy of the plans, cost estimates and the financial strategy for this project, whether it comes through the attorney or Mr. Gravely.

Counsel Blackwood asked if these were the proposed plans for renovating and fixing the improvements that are there and filling the Commission's needs for approving the project as opposed as to just what's already in existence and Mr. Gravely is still needing to develop?

Ms. Johnson-Tonkins said she had asked Mr. Gravely about the plans that he had already received and he said they were in good condition. He said he thought the plans were of the existing structure and he thought Mr. Defreitas was trying to do improvements beyond the existing structure. Mr. Defreitas has since backed off the idea of trying to add on to the house or do extra improvement as far as adding on. The plans he presented encompass the work

that has been done so far. He removed a fireplace so the existing plans show that the fireplace has been removed and the stairs have been added. The site plans will show what the homeowners plan to do with the outside structure of the home as well as the property surrounding the home.

Counsel Blackwood said he was trying to get clarification because when he was here earlier he got the impression that what had been presented to Mr. Gravely was existing documentation.

Mr. Curry said what appears to be happening at this point, they haven't seen any of the information yet, is that Mr. Defrietas has somebody else preparing these plans and Mr. Gravely is not doing a whole lot of extra plan work, but he thought they were using Mr. Gravely to coordinate and work on the feasibility end of it. The role of the Commission really is not to approve their plans because the Commission has no role in their project. The Commission's role is to determine whether you want to proceed with your acquisition process so you are trying to get a handle on whether the owner has the capability to do their proposed work. The feasibility piece of this is the critical component that gets to looking at what they are proposing to do, but then really understanding the resources that the owner has to accomplish the project and the time frames within which they are able to get the work done. Staff will work with the owner and Mr. Gravely in trying to put the feasibility piece of this together and make sure at your next meeting that staff has been able to get as much as they can get to the Commission.

Ms. Johnson-Tonkins said Mr. Defrietas had indicated to her that the next meeting would be on November 15 at 5 o'clock.

There was a discussion as to what the Commission would need documented at its November meeting. Also all the information had to be in staff's hands so that they will have time to analyze it before the November meeting.

Ms. Johnson-Tonkins said Mr. Curry was right. Someone other than Mr. Gravely was doing the plans. They have to reach Mr. Gravely, he had to review them to see how he could really facilitate helping Mr. Defreitias reach the goal that needs to be reached. Since there is a middleman, it is taking a lot longer than they had anticipated. In talking with Mr. Gravely today, once he gets the plan, from that point he was kind of taking over. Because Mr. Defrietas was trying to save some of the costs in having the plans done, this is the reason he chose this particular route. She had to talk with Mr. Gravely about the cost figures because that would determine what the feasibility plan would look like. She could get staff what she has now and as it comes in.

Mr. Curry said staff preferred to have the information two weeks prior to the Commission meeting so that they will have time to look at the information and communicate back and forth before they actually put the agenda together. So that would roughly be two weeks from now they would like to have that information. Staff would like to have the full package to look at. If there was a set of plans of what they are proposing to do on the property, staff could look at that initially and at least get that piece of the review out of the way in terms of determining

whether what they are proposing to do will fit in with the rest of the block. He suggested that if they had a full set of site plans within the next few days, it would be good to get those to staff as soon as possible.

Chair Wood moved that any future action on this item be tabled until next month when the Commission hopes to have a clearer indication of what is being done. Mr. Lilly seconded the motion. The Commission voted 3-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wood, Leimenstoll, Lilly. Nays: None. Abstain: Benjamin.)

3. OLD ASHEBORO NEIGHBORHOOD. TRANSFER OF PROPERTY TO GREENSBORO HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP, INC. (CONTINUED)

Counsel Blackwood said the item on this agenda was on your agenda last month, calling for a public hearing. He said counsel was asleep at the wheel and they had normally handled these matters by proposing to convey to Greensboro Housing Development Partnership by negotiated bid, subject to upset. They then are under a purchase contract that specified a proposed resolution, which basically called for being market developed and the net proceeds from sale would then return to the Commission. Pending that return of resales, the properties would be subject to a deed of trust in favor of the Commission, which is a similar manner in which properties were disposed of in the Southside Neighborhood from time to time.

Counsel Blackwood said the resolution could be read into the record or attached.

Ms. Harris said she there are 51 parcels, including 3 that are on the acquisition list.

Counsel Blackwood said the Commission could not transfer property until it actually had title, but they can enter into a contract to transfer.

Chair Wood read the following resolution into the record:

RESOLUTION OF REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO AUTHORIZING PROPOSED ACCEPTANCE OF CONTRACT FOR OFFER TO SELL PROPERTY TO GREENSBORO HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP, INC.

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Commission (the "Commission") has previously adopted a Redevelopment Plan for Ole Asheboro as amended, which includes the hereinafter described property within the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area;

WHEREAS, The Commission proposes to enter into a purchase contract for the hereinafter described property located within the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area, subject to the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Plan as amended to Greensboro Housing Development Partnership, Inc., pursuant to the terms of North Carolina General Statute §160A-514 and §160A-269;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it is resolved that in accordance with North Carolina General Statute §160A-514 and §160A-269 the Commission hereby proposes to enter into a sale for all of the property described on the

attached Exhibit A (the "Property") to the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership, Inc., a North Carolina Non-Profit Corporation under a Purchase Contract, which will include the following terms:

- a) Purchaser agrees to market and sell the above-described property in accordance with the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Plan, as amended;*
- b) All properties to be sold by purchaser shall be subject to Restrictive Covenants approved by the Commission;*
- c) The purchaser shall further provide that the plans for development including all site plans, declarations and other development requirements, shall be subject to the right of the Redevelopment Commission, in its sole discretion, to review the same;*
- d) That the purchaser shall be further required to follow the plans for the Traditional Neighborhood Development Plan for said property;*
- e) That the purchaser shall be required to pay to the Commission for the purchase of the above properties in an amount determined as net proceeds of resale of each such parcel of such Property as it occurs less actual direct costs incurred by the purchaser by the same and that no sale shall be allowed to any other legal entity in which purchaser directly or indirectly has any interest in the same;*
- f) Purchaser will be required to execute a deed of trust in favor of the Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro obligating itself to the performance of all the above stated provisions;*
- g) The properties to be sold as listed on the attached Exhibit A are subject to final determination by The Commission and Purchaser and may be sold at separate closings as determined by the parties;*
- h) That pursuant to the Statutes the proposed sale shall be advertised to be subject to upset bid and if any other bid is received, then said contract shall be re-advertised in accordance with the terms and provisions of North Carolina General Statutes;*
- i) That if no further bid is received and the purchaser remains the Greensboro Housing Development Partnership, Inc., without upset bid, then the Commission, subject to the approval of the City Council of the City of Greensboro, is authorized to enter into said purchase contract with the purchaser;*
- j) The proposed purchase is subject to the ongoing condition that the Commission and City Council of Greensboro may at anytime reject any and all offers, including that of the purchaser.*

Mr. Benjamin moved that the Commission approve the above resolution. Mr. Lilly seconded the motion.

Mr. Benjamin said he thought the last time they did this, he was not in favor of it. He was more comfortable that they had a fairly good set of safeguards. He asked if all of this property were zoned Traditional Neighborhood?

Mr. Curry said the TND Plan is in the approval process right now. Earlier today, the City's Technical Review Committee made the recommendation to approve it. It will go to the Planning Board in November for approval. Then they could file a Zoning application for the TND zoning. He thought it would go through the zoning process in December and January. At that point, that entire district would be zoned for TN. He assured Mr. Benjamin that they would not transfer any of those properties in that time frame. Potentially this item will be before City Council, assuming there are no upset bids in December.

Chair Wood called the question. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wood, Benjamin, Leimenstoll, Lilly. Nays: None.)

Chair Wood asked if anyone had any other business to come before the Commission.

Mr. Leimenstoll said he wanted to express his appreciation on having people from Code Enforcement attend.

Mr. Benjamin said it was helpful having them attend so that the Commission could know what they could and could not do.

Mr. Curry said he wanted to thank Mr. Leimenstoll. He went way above and beyond the call on the Bingham Street Project. He worked the design issue over and over again this last week and you have a much better project as a result.

* * * * *

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully,

Dan Curry, Assistant Secretary
Greensboro Redevelopment Commission

DC/ts.ps.